

made the problem even worse. I hope that my colleagues will take the time to review the report and will reach the same conclusions that I did. In the end, it was clear to me that we must do three things.

First, we must continue to increase funding for parts and keep it predictable.

Second, we must completely modernize the C-5 fleet with new avionics and the Reliability Enhancement and Re-engining Program.

Third, we must continue to promote smart management reform throughout the defense logistics system.

Again, I know that none of this is news to my colleagues on the defense committees who have provided so much leadership and support for addressing these challenges, but I hope the report will be helpful to them and their staffs and to other colleagues.

I know that spare and repair parts is not glamorous, but it is vital to America's ability to protect and promote our national security. For that reason, we must build on the good work done by the defense committees over the past four years to begin to solve the parts shortage problem and ensure that we do not lose sight of what must be done now and in the future to eliminate the problem.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about hate crimes legislation I introduced with Senator KENNEDY last month. The Local Law Enforcement Act of 2001 would add new categories to current hate crimes legislation sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to detail a heinous crime that occurred October 31, 1999 off the coast of California. A 37-year-old gay man was the target of a brutal anti-gay attack on board a cruise ship. The victim was assaulted by two other passengers in a hallway of the ship, who called him a "f—ing faggot" several times. He sustained injuries including a broken nose, three skull fractures around his eyes, chipped teeth and multiple contusions. Because the attack happened at sea, beyond the reach of state and local laws, police have been unable to pursue the case as a bias-related incident, referring it instead to the federal government.

I believe that government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act of 2001 is now a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation, we can change hearts and minds as well.

THE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH AT NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise to offer a few observations regarding

the President's speech at the National Defense University regarding missile defense and the future security of our nation. The President was quite correct in describing today's world as one that is far different from the days of the Cold War some thirty years ago. However, his prescription for how best to ensure our national security and achieve a more peaceful world is seriously flawed. The President has assigned the nation's highest military priority to building a robust missile defense that will cost tens of billions of dollars during the coming decade with no assurance that the system of interceptors will work. The primary objective of such a system, in his view, is to counteract intercontinental missiles carrying weapons of mass destruction from targeting our nation. I would urge the President to take a step back; a more effective and higher priority approach would be to cut off weapons of mass destruction at their source, before they are in the hands of our potential enemies. The greatest potential source of those weapons, materials, and technological expertise resides in Russia, and therein lies the fundamental key to our national and global security.

The President's view of Russia misunderstands this important point. While it is true that, in the President's words, Russia is no longer a communist country and that its president is an elected official, it does not follow that we needn't worry about the security threat which it can pose to the United States and our allies. Indeed, there are very disturbing stories in the press about the internal dynamics of the Russian government and its fragile democratic ways. Its economy remains in dire straits, unemployment is high, and the future, particularly for those who live outside of Moscow, continues to look grim. I'm certain that many of us were alarmed at the recent mutual recriminations and dismissals of dozens of Americans and Russians in an exchange that hearkened back to Cold War days.

In Russia's weakened state, I believe it poses an even greater threat to the United States than the "nations of concern" that we hear about so often. Why is that? Aside from the United States, Russia is the most advanced nation in the world to possess advanced missile technologies and weapons of mass destruction. Its scientific expertise is second only to our own. Weapons of mass destruction, including chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons, number in the tens of thousands, and materials that go into making those weapons are widely distributed, and poorly guarded, around Russia. If countries of concern pose a serious threat to the United States, it is likely that the tools underlying those threats have been or could most easily be gained from the most likely source, a cash-strapped, antagonistic Russia.

Senior advisors to the Secretary of Energy, including former Senators

Howard Baker and Sam Nunn, recently released a report that stated, "The most urgent unmet national security threat to the United States today is the danger that weapons of mass destruction or weapons-usable material in Russia could be stolen and sold to terrorists or hostile nation states" Having reviewed the scope of the WMD threat in Russia, the Secretary of Energy's Advisory Board recommended that the United States spend \$30 billion over the next decade to secure those weapons and materials, and to prevent Russia's technological expertise from finding paychecks in the wrong places. Despite that recommendation, the President has submitted a budget request to the Congress that cuts funding for those programs by \$100 million below what was appropriated a year ago. In fact, this year's funding request is over \$500 million below what was planned for FY 2002 just twelve months ago. I question why the President would choose to cut funding for programs that constitute the nation's "most urgent unmet threat." In light of the imposing costs of a robust missile defense system, it appears that the Administration has determined that such nonproliferation programs are of secondary importance.

Listening to the President's speech, I'm concerned that his vision of missile defense has all the characteristics of the boy sticking his finger in the dike. What's really needed is a new and stronger dike. I believe we must redouble our efforts to support critical nonproliferation programs with Russia as the first line of our own defense and national security interest. Investing tens of billions of dollars in a missile defense program as an alternative approach virtually insures the acceleration of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction if the nation reduces funding for nonproliferation programs as a result. The President and his advisors are missing the forest for the trees.

Let me add one additional thought. Countries of concern that may be genuinely interested in using weapons of mass destruction against us or our allies are likely to choose methods that are affordable, effective, and unanticipated. An intercontinental ballistic missile could be one way to achieve their goal, but there are other, less expensive and more probable ways. Potential enemies seeking to disrupt and destroy the U.S. and our friends, for example, could achieve their aims through weapons delivered in suitcases, small boats, or delivery vans. If the United States devotes its attention, resources, and expertise to solve the potential intercontinental missile threat without addressing the possibility of low tech applications of weapons of mass destruction, we will have made a very grave error. I urge my colleagues, Mr. President, not to be lulled into a false sense of security regarding plans for a robust missile defense of our nation. As with the case of the dike, deployment of a missile defense system

may simply redirect the flow of the threat.

That assumes, that we actually have a missile defense system that works. We are a long, long way from that capability, a fact that I hope that we in the Senate and the American people fully understand. I am pleased that the President did not announce the unilateral abrogation of the ABM Treaty in that regard. It would be foolhardy, in my opinion, to step back from our legal obligations under that Treaty without having the means to defend ourselves—a missile defense system that works. Make no mistake, my colleagues, the unilateral abrogation of the ABM Treaty will have major negative security consequences for the United States and our allies and friends. I urge my colleagues, regardless of how they feel about the ABM Treaty, to join me and other senators to insist that any missile defense system be successfully tested in realistic operational conditions before making any decision to deploy it. The American taxpayer being asked to provide tens of billions of dollars to support that effort, not to mention the men and women in uniform who would operate it, deserve nothing less than a system that works.

I applaud the President's desire for building cooperative relationships that should be "reassuring, rather than threatening . . . premised on openness, mutual confidence and real opportunities for cooperation, including the area of missile defense." There are many important ways to achieve those goals that are currently at risk in the worsening climate of U.S.-Russian relations, particularly if the President chooses to abrogate the ABM Treaty either in word or in deed. Cooperation and reassurance are important byproducts of our nonproliferation programs in Russia that have yielded major dividends in preventing the loss of weapons and materials of mass destruction to those who would be our enemies. Greater emphasis, not less, is needed for such programs. In addition, we have made important confidence-building progress in cooperative approaches regarding early warning of missile attacks through the establishment of a data center and research being conducted on the Russian American Observation Satellite program. I am deeply concerned that such confidence-building programs will be at risk should confrontational relations with Russia continue to increase. If that occurs, the ultimate loser could be ourselves in a less secure world of our own making.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Tuesday, May 8, 2001, the Federal debt stood at \$5,647,881,033,420.09, five trillion, six hundred forty-seven billion, eight hundred eighty-one million, thirty-three thousand, four hundred twenty dollars and nine cents.

One year ago, May 8, 2000, the Federal debt stood at \$5,662,693,000,000, five

trillion, six hundred sixty-two billion, six hundred ninety-three million.

Five years ago, May 8, 1996, the Federal debt stood at \$5,094,597,000,000, five trillion, ninety-four billion, five hundred ninety-seven million.

Ten years ago, May 8, 1991, the Federal debt stood at \$3,440,039,000,000, three trillion, four hundred forty billion, thirty-nine million.

Fifteen years ago, May 8, 1986, the Federal debt stood at \$2,015,014,000,000, two trillion, fifteen billion, fourteen million, which reflects a debt increase of more than \$3.5 trillion, \$3,632,867,033,420.09, three trillion, six hundred thirty-two billion, eight hundred sixty-seven million, thirty-three thousand, four hundred twenty dollars and nine cents during the past 15 years.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

NATIONAL PET WEEK

• Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I often rise on the floor of the Senate and put on my "veterinarian hat" when talking about food safety, animal science or even small business issues. Today, I rise to recognize this week as National Pet Week and say a brief word about the role of pets in our lives. Events taking place all over the Nation this week are designed to remind us of the value of pets.

Sponsored by several leading veterinary organizations, principally the American Veterinary Medical Association (AVMA), National Pet Week gives those of us in the animal health field an opportunity to celebrate the bond between pets and their owners and address the importance of responsible pet ownership. Pets are important members of over half the households in America. They can be many different things to many different people. A pet can be a hunting companion, someone to play catch with, something warm to curl up on your lap, an additional ranch hand, a guide, a guardian, or a child's best friend. Indeed, companionship is often the most important aspect in the relationship between pet and owner.

In the past 25 years, we have come to accept the human-animal bond as an important force. We understand that the bond exists, but it is hard to define. The AVMA gives us this definition:

The human-animal bond is a mutually beneficial and dynamic relationship between people and animals that is influenced by behaviors that are essential to the health and well-being of both. This includes but is not limited to, emotional, psychological and physical interaction of people, animals and the environment.

The fact is, the addition of a pet to someone's life can do amazing things. Studies have shown that the recovery time and survival rate of people with serious illness can be improved when a pet is part of the equation. The benefits of pets to the blind and disabled are also well known. All over the

world, dogs are trained to complete a variety of tasks to assist the disabled in living their lives. Programs to train dogs and place them with disabled owners thrive in every State. The work that they do and the good that results should not go unnoticed. These organizations build new bridges using the human-animal bond formula and enrich lives in so many ways.

Connections between pets and children are well known. Pets can help teach children responsibility, respect and compassion. They can add to a child's growth and development in so many ways. Most of us can certainly remember our first family pet with fond memories. The other part of National Pet Week is pet health. It is certainly true that a healthy pet is a happy pet. Regular veterinarian visits are indeed important and are part of the responsibility as an owner and as a family member. Nutritional care, adequate exercise and proper attention to general health concerns are all necessary in the ownership of a pet and can go a long way in increasing the quality of an animal's life.

So I would like to ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing National Pet Week, and if you have a pet at home, give it an extra hug, a pat on the head or a good scratch in that favorite spot when you get home.●

NATIONAL DANCE INSTITUTE IN NEW MEXICO

• Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to commend a friend, Val Diker, for her unflagging efforts in support of the National Dance Institute in New Mexico. As many of my colleagues know, the NDI was founded by the renowned dancer, Jacques d'Amboise, to introduce school children to dance. His dream has been extremely successful in New Mexico in the eight years since it was started here. This year alone there are 2400 students in 32 schools involved in the program.

This weekend, five hundred of these students will appear on the stage of the newly-refurbished, historic Lensic Theatre to honor the program and Val Diker, the Founding Chairman. Making our state her "second home," Val is a leading contributor with her time, talent and treasure to institutions New Mexicans love. Her leadership in NDI, however, is particularly appreciated by all who value those who give and do so much to help children. Val has made a difference in lives of children she'll never see, and for that she deserves our heartfelt thanks. She, and this wonderful institute, certainly have mine.●

IN RECOGNITION OF JOE B. MURRAY

• Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I recently received a copy of *To Be as Brave*, a collection of memoirs of Joe B. "Bob" Murray. This fine book tells the story of a great American, who evolved from an East Texas farm boy